MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 27, 1939

The seventh meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1939 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on January 27, 1939. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Borie,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Shepley,
Mr. Manship,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:45 a. m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting held December 10, 1938, were approved.

2. THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: Mr. Clarke brought to the attention of the Commission the question of having a report printed for the information of members of Congress concerning the Thomas Jefferson Memorial, with a view to clearing up misrepresentations made at the time the appropriation for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial was made last spring, both at committee hearings and on the floor of Congress. Mr. Clarke said the data is in manuscript form and that it consists of information Congress should have before making any further appropriation for the Memorial. It is understood that the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission expects an appropriation of $2,000,000 from this Congress.

The Commission discussed this matter and decided that it would doubtless be a good thing to have the document printed as a report to Congress with the understanding each member of the Commission will be allowed to review the draft. It was decided also to include in the document the recent correspondence with Stuart Gibboney, the Acting Chairman, in which Mr. Clarke reported

constructive criticism made by the Commission concerning the plans for the Memorial. On motion properly moved and seconded it was decided to have this material on the Thomas Jefferson Memorial printed as a public document for the information of the members of Congress.

Thereupon the Commission discussed the criticisms set forth in recent correspondence with Mr. Stuart Gibboney concerning the plans of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. Mr. Clarke reported that on December 22, 1938, he and Mr. Lamb were in conference with Otto Eggers, the architect of the Memorial, concerning the plans and at that meeting a number of important changes in the plans were recommended, which were set forth in a letter to Mr. Gibboney. (Exhibit A). In particular Mr. Clarke called attention to the fact that toilets on the main floor were indicated at the right and left entrances of the building, present most objectionable features. Mr. Clarke said he and Mr. Lamb agreed that the toilet rooms, if they are at all necessary in that vicinity, should be placed in separate structures away from the Memorial and hidden by planting. Secondly they might be placed underneath the terrace. The possibility of placing the toilet rooms back from the central part of the Memorial around a corner was discussed as being better than what is now shown in the plans.

Mr. Clarke said: We have just received a copy of a memorandum from the Chief of the Survey and Construction Division to the Director of the National Park Service, as follows:

January 26, 1939.

Memorandum for The Director:

A review of the revised specifications for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Superstructure as submitted by the Architects on January 20 indicates that they had made the following disposition of the recommendations by the Fine Arts Commission:

The carving of the panels is not included in the specifications. This portion of the work is left for future consideration.

The light standards are omitted.

The pedestal for the statue is omitted.

There is a provision for taking an alternative for omission of tripods, leaving the final decision to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission.

The toilet rooms are left in the Memorial as originally planned by the Architects.

There will be alternatives covering the suggestions by the Fine Arts Commission as they relate to the use of limestone and marble, leaving the final decision to the Jefferson Memorial Commission when the bids are canvassed.

(Signed) F. F. Gillen,
Chief, Survey & Construction
Division.

You will note, Mr. Clarke said, that nothing has been done about removing the toilet rooms. It is evident the architects are running into the question of extra cost and will do nothing about the matter.

The Commission agreed with Mr. Clarke that the toilet rooms are most offensive in any memorial. Mr. Savage protested strongly against keeping them, saying that it would be a desecration of the Memorial. Mr. Manship said that there are many people who have no particular regard for memorials and will consider this simply a glorified comfort station. It was thereupon decided to call in Mr. Gillen for a conference concerning this matter.

Mr. Gillen said that the National Park Service had the toilet rooms included in the design because of the experience at the Lincoln Memorial where they had to be constructed outside the building under the terrace sometime after the memorial had been completed and the work was done at considerable cost. For the Thomas Jefferson Memorial toilet rooms were also first shown in the terrace. Mr. Gillen said: "We gave the architects a list of requirements for operation. The next

The carving of the panels is not included in the specifications. This portion of the work is left for future consideration.

The light standards are omitted.

The pedestal for the statue is omitted.

There is a provision for taking an alternative for omission of tripods, leaving the final decision to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission.

The toilet rooms are left in the Memorial as originally planned by the Architects.

There will be alternatives covering the suggestions by the Fine Arts Commission as they relate to the use of limestone and marble, leaving the final decision to the Jefferson Memorial Commission when the bids are canvassed.

(Signed) P. P. Gillen,
Chief, Survey & Construction
Division.

You will note, Mr. Clarke said, that nothing has been done about removing the toilet rooms. It is evident the architects are running into the question of extra cost and will do nothing about the matter.

The Commission agreed with Mr. Clarke that the toilet rooms are most offensive in any memorial. Mr. Savage protested strongly against keeping them, saying that it would be a desecration of the Memorial. Mr. Mansfield said that there are many people who have no particular regard for memorials and will consider this simply a glorified comfort station. It was thereupon decided to call in Mr. Gillen for a conference concerning this matter.

Mr. Gillen said that the National Park Service had the toilet rooms included in the design because of the experience at the Lincoln Memorial where they had to be constructed outside the building under the terrace sometime after the memorial had been completed and the work was done at considerable cost. For the Thomas Jefferson Memorial toilet rooms were also first shown in the terrace. Mr. Gillen said: "We gave the architects a list of requirements for operation. The next

time they submitted designs the toilet rooms were shown in the building. One of the men said if they were put around at the side back of the columns they would not be in control and it would be necessary to have an extra guard.

Mr. Clarke said that any one who spends money on memorials and places toilets in them should not be in the Government service. "The point is this: We have an obligation here to secure a dignified memorial to Thomas Jefferson and we cannot subscribe to placing toilet rooms in the Memorial. There is plenty of room away from the building. We have an obligation in this Commission to set a policy and if the National Park Service is going to subscribe to putting public toilets in memorial buildings, we are in a pretty hapless situation. I think it is an outrageous precedent to establish. I don't often get excited but this is a very serious situation. You people ought to be very careful how you make recommendations."

Mr. Gillen said the National Park Service did not make the recommendation to place toilet rooms in the Memorial. He said, "We simply informed them of the requirements for operating the building. To construct toilet rooms in the terrace would be an added cost and the memorial has to bear the expense."

Mr. Clarke said finally, in behalf of the Commission, that the Commission must insist on having the toilet rooms placed away from the building in a grove of trees or having them placed in the terrace. Mr. Gillen replied that he wasn't responsible for showing the toilet rooms in the designs and it is merely his duty to carry out orders. Mr. Clarke replied that he realized this and had asked him for this talk with the Commission so they could have an understanding of the situation.

Thereupon Mr. Gillen withdrew and the Commission discussed the matter further and finally agreed that the Chairman should send a strong letter of protest to

Mr. Stuart Gibboney with regard to the toilet rooms, urging that they be omitted from the main floor of the memorial. Mr. Clarke said he would do this. (Exhibit A-1 (Exhibit A-2) (See also A-3)

3. DESIGN FOR GREYHOUND BUS TERMINAL: The Commission considered a design submitted by the firm of Wischmeyer, Arrasmith and Elswick of Louisville, Kentucky for a new Greyhound Bus Terminal to be built on the south side of New York Avenue between 11th and 12th Streets. The design was submitted voluntarily by Mr. Arrasmith with the statement that the firm would appreciate any comments the Commission of Fine Arts might have to make. He said it is to be a building copies of which are to be built in about 25 other cities in the United States. The Secretary reported that when Mr. Arrasmith submitted the design he said that the firm proposes to use either limestone or possibly pieces of marble discarded by the contractor for the National Gallery of Art.

Prints of the design had been sent to the architect members of the Commission. Mr. Lamb reported that he would recommend acceptance of the design. Mr. Borie stated that he disapproved it since he considered it not to be in conformity with Washington architecture. Mr. Shepley said it is not a distinguished piece of design and is self-conscious. The design represents a phase of contemporary architecture which has already been outmoded and therefore it would be a mistake to build it out of permanent and expensive material. Mr. Clarke felt the design was out of character with the architecture of approved monumental buildings in the National Capital.

The Commission disapproved the design and a report was sent to the architects accordingly. (Exhibit B)

4. WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Mr. Louis Simon and Lieut. Colonel Le Roy Barton, A. I. A., the newly appointed Supervising Architect, accompanied by

Mr. Underwood and Mr. Foster, Architects of the Procurement Division, submitted a model of the War Department Building for the location at the west side of the intersection of Virginia and New York Avenues. The building was shown in relation to the new Interior Department Building and the Federal Reserve Building. Mr. Underwood explained the model, pointing out that the model presents the entire scheme although at this meeting the Procurement Division desires simply the approval of the first unit of the building. The model presents the result of four months of study of the project in cooperation with the Fine Arts Commission. Congress has made an appropriation of $3,000,000 for the first unit and it is proposed to begin construction as soon as possible. A perspective of the first unit was also submitted. The building is to house the office of the Secretary of War and his staff.

The Commission felt the facade of the main entrance made an impressive appearance. Mr. Manship suggested cresting over the entrance. The building is of the same height above sea level as the Interior Department Building although with its seven stories the War Department has one story less than the Interior Building, due to a higher elevation (53 feet).

Mr. Underwood said the east and west axis was established by a rule of the Park and Planning Commission, which requires that this axis be 216.37 feet south of E Street. All the plans have been made and now the Park and Planning Commission calls attention to the fact that there are only 9 feet of parking space on the north side of the new Interior Department Building and a similar width for the new War Department Building and that the Park and Planning Commission wants this parking area for the War Department building widened. Mr. Underwood stated the only way this can be done would be to decrease the entrance court to the first unit of the War Department Building by 22 feet and this would make it out of scale with the rest of the building. A spacious court is needed to give strength and

majesty to the building. The nine-foot parking strip he said is only along the projections that face E Street. The intervening spaces consist of re-entrant courts 30 feet deep. The War Department has one story in the setback instead of two as the Interior Department.

As for the rest of the building, it is understood this will be given further study later, particularly the question of height in relation to the Lincoln Memorial. The 23rd Street facade and the 22nd Street facade will be of the same length as the Interior Department.

As for the rest of the building, it is understood this will be given further study later, particularly the question of height in relation to the Lincoln Memorial. The 23rd Street facade and the 22nd Street facade will be of the same length as the Interior Department building. Mr. Underwood said the Fort and Planning Commission was anxious to have the southwest corner of the building at 23rd and C Streets chopped off so as to break up the long facade on 23rd Street. Also there is to be a wall on 23rd Street 20 feet high and it will create something of a canyon. It was recalled that for the C Street facade the Commission of Fine Arts had previously recommended a re-entrant court at 22nd Street.

The Commission were well pleased with the appearance of the first unit of the building and approved it with the understanding that certain details, such as fenestration on the west side be embodied in the final drawings. The Commission also approved the location. Mr. Shepley urged that the building be kept as simple as possible and that any ornamentation be of a restrained character. Mr. Clarke recommended two flagpoles instead of one in front of the building. Mr. Borie urged that it would be better to have two flagpoles since they then would be decorative whereas one flagpole suggests a military post. A report was sent to Mr. Simon approving the design. (Exhibit C)

5. CENSUS BUREAU BUILDING: Mr. Simon reported that the sum of $3,500,000 has been appropriated by the House of Representatives in the pending Deficiency Bill for a Census Building, which is to house 7,000-8,000 census people and is to be completed by December of this year in time for the 1940 census. The building is to be located on the square between Second and Third Streets, D Street and Virginia Avenue, S. W., adjacent to the Railroad.

Mr. Simon explained the situation, saying that enumerators go all over the country and send in schedules in bound volumes and these are brought to Washington by the carload. Cards, which come over from the Government Printing Office by the millions, are then made out and punched. I think the Census said they had 600,000,000 cards which are being constantly shifted from one place to the other. In short, it is a kind of factory business. The whole situation was discussed very thoroughly by the Advisory Committee on Architectural Design.

Mr. Simon called attention to various features of the design. He said it is to be an eight-story brick building of the warehouse type, of a bluish-gray brick with limestone at the base. The building will be 90 feet high out of a permissible height of 103 feet. There are to be 1,500 windows. Mr. Shepley and Mr. Borie felt that the windows gave the design something of the appearance of a sieve and that an improvement would be made in the appearance of the facade. The horizontal or vertical arrangement of the windows is a matter of choice. Mr. Borie said: "In the spirit of carrying this through as an all over pattern, I am suggesting that the alternate squares be of the same brick but all headers, making a checkerboard pattern." Mr. Shepley favored such a scheme and offered it as alternate treatment of pier spandrels. All the pier spandrels would be headers and the space between the spandrels (window spandrels) would be stretchers. Mr. Borie and Mr. Shepley illustrated this scheme on the blue print.

The question of marquee was discussed and it was felt it would be better to carry the entrance doors back to the vestibule than to build a marquee.

The Commission approved the preliminary studies with the recommendation that in the direction of the philosophy of the building the pier spandrels might be made of definite bond, giving a more interesting pattern by an alternate treatment of the pier and window spandrels; also that a gray brick without brownish or yellowish cast be used and that a sample of the brick be submitted. A letter of approval subject to these recommendations was sent to Mr. Simon. (Exhibit D)

8. WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT: The secretary brought to the attention of the Commission a large photographic aerial map of Washington and vicinity which he received from Colonel Sumpter Smith, Chairman of the Engineering Commission of the Washington National Airport and Chairman of the Board of Safety of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, Department of Commerce. The secretary explained the preliminary scheme of the proposed airport to be developed on Gravelly Point. It will comprise about 700 acres and will extend from Jefferson Davis adjacent to the Mount Vernon Highway just south of the Long Bridge, to Four Mile Run, a distance of about two miles. There will be a channel of 3,250 feet in the river and the rest of the Gravelly Point area will consist of earth fill, a work which is being carried out by the U. S. Engineer's Office. The distance from the edge of the channel westward to the Mount Vernon Highway will average from three-quarters to one mile. The airport will have four or five runways each approximately 4,000 feet long. It is proposed to construct the administration building near the Mount Vernon Highway as also six or eight large hangars, not far from the Bureau of Public Roads Laboratories. It will be necessary to relocate the Mount Vernon Highway just south of the laboratory grounds so as to make room for the 4,000 foot east and west runway.

The suggestion was presented in detail by Colonel Smith personally during the afternoon at the joint meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Mr. Clarke said the question of relocating the Mount Vernon Highway

is a very important matter which must be given careful study. Mr. Clarke was of the opinion that there should be a two-way highway in this section, the northbound traffic to extend along the river and the south bound to be adjacent to the railroad tracks.

Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Assistant Director of the Procurement Division, was present to explain in a preliminary way the building project which is to be in charge of the Procurement Division. He said so far as the Procurement Division is concerned, they have done practically nothing in the matter in view of the question of location of runways and the like by the airport authorities.

Mr. Clarke, speaking for the Commission of Fine Arts, said that the Commission would cooperate in this matter and would be glad to see preliminary sketches any time Mr. Reynolds would have them for submission to the Commission of Fine Arts.

7. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIBRARY: Mr. Nathan C. Myers, Municipal Architect, accompanied by Mr. J. Guilfriel and Dr. George M. Bowerman, Librarian of the District of Columbia, submitted a preliminary design for the new public library intended for square 491 at John Marshall Place and Pennsylvania Avenue. Only a section of the first unit of the building, facing Pennsylvania Avenue, was shown in the design. There are no funds for the building but Congress has authorized the preparation of plans.

The building was designed in the Early Federal style of architecture and in harmony with the department buildings in the triangle with a cornice height of 81 feet. The main entrance to the building is to be from Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Morris and Mr. Shepley gave the design particular attention. The facade with its piers and arrangement of windows was criticized and Mr. Myers was asked to give this matter further study.

The Commission felt that the red roof of the Triangle buildings need not be repeated on the library building. Mr. Shepley felt that a setback and block top would be appropriate. Mr. Shepley, speaking for the Commission, said the building should follow the line of Pennsylvania Avenue and the cornice line should be the same as that of the buildings in the triangle south of Pennsylvania Avenue. The red roof should be omitted and Mr. Wyeth should study the building in more simplified form. The Commission considered this simply preliminary submission of the design. At the afternoon session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission both Commissions agreed that Mr. Wyeth should submit a design for the entire square between Fourth and Sixth Streets facing Pennsylvania Avenue.

8. SCULPTURE AND PAINTING FOR THE MUNICIPAL CENTER: Mr. Wyeth said an allotment of $100,000 has been made for sculpture and two ceramics for the new Municipal Building, and he desired advice as to selection of artists, whether by direct selection or by competition. The Commission did not favor having a competition conducted by the Section of Painting and Sculpture of the Procurement Division for this work. Mr. Wyeth said that he would prefer direct selection of artists as it would be a saving of time and money. The two ceramics he said are to be 60 feet by 12 feet in size and are to be located about 20 feet high in the court. Varnum Poor has been suggested for one of them, Mr. Wyeth said. The sculpture proposed is for two pediments facing John Marshall Place and four groups of sculpture in the courts.

The Commission asked for information on the division of funds for the painting and the sculpture. Attention was called to the groups for the Annex Building, for which $47,000 had been allotted. A 70-30 basis was therefore considered as a fair division. The Commission felt that it was not money enough to produce sculpture for the two pediments and this will therefore be omitted. For two

groups to flank the entrances on John Marshall Place, Mr. Manship recommended a list of sculptors; and Mr. Savage was asked to recommend several painters in addition to Mr. Poor for the two ceramics. A report was sent to Mr. Wyeth accordingly. (Exhibit E)

9. MARCONI MEMORIAL: Mr. Clarke reported that he was in Washington on January 1 and in company with Mr. Cammerer inspected possible new locations for the Marconi Memorial. The Marconi Memorial Committee had disapproved the erection of the memorial in Meridian Hill Park. Mr. Clarke said he selected the reservation at 16th Street and Columbia Road, which is a block from the Italian Embassy. The Commission concurred in this selection and a report was sent to Mr. Di Falco accordingly. (Exhibit F)

The secretary stated that he had had a brief talk with Mr. Di Falco a few days ago, who said his committee is going to come to Washington and inspect the site at 16th and Columbia Road before making a final decision in the matter.

10. APARTMENT BUILDING FOR 20TH AND F STREETS, N. W.: Mr. Harry L. Edwards, architect for the Cafritz Company, Washington, submitted a preliminary design for a new apartment building at 20th and F Streets, N. W. It is to be 80 feet high and was designed so as to be similar in appearance to the apartment building immediately to the west of the old Interior Building at 19th and F Streets. The Commission decided that the design is entirely out of keeping with the National Capital. Mr. Shepley, speaking for the Commission, said:

> The Commission has looked at this and none of us will willingly approve it. I think the feeling is that the appearance is entirely at variance with the feeling of Washington. We could not approve a thing like that so near to the center of Washington as this is going to be; it will have to be in another feeling--more calmness, more serenity. Brick would be all right. We would not insist on limestone but brick the color of limestone. Also in your next design you should show how the building will turn the corner.

Mr. Clarke said the Commission did not like the fenestration and the restless parapet line. Mr. Clarke then told Mr. Edwards that he should give the matter further study and submit a new design which would be given attention by the Commission of Fine Arts whenever is possible. Mr. Clarke explained that the building is in the Shipstead-Luce Act area, which requires approval of the design by the Commission. There is no objection to erecting an apartment building here but the architecture should be more restrained and dignified, simple and clear-cut.

11. GREAT FALLS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING: Mr. Vint, Chief Architect of the National Park Service, submitted a design for the general development of Great Falls, Maryland, adjacent to the C and O Canal, including reconstruction of the levee. The proposed development is still preliminary in nature. The National Park Service intends to develop this area and the Maryland side of Great Falls Gorge. The plan suggested an administration building, boat-houses, docks, etc. Mr. Clarke stated that this is such a big scheme that no one could pass judgment on it without first having visited the site and agreeable to the Commission he would aks that the plan be referred to him for study and report. The Commission accordingly referred the plan to Mr. Clarke.

12. PLANTING SCHEME FOR THE NORTH INTERIOR BUILDING: Mr. Vint and Mr. Kline submitted a planting scheme for the North Interior Building. The Commission referred the plan to Mr. Clarke for study and report.

13. EAST POTOMAC PARK TOURIST CAMP: Mr. Vint and Mr. Kline submitted sketches for permanent buildings at the East Potomac Park Tourist Camp. The Commission called attention to the fact that the existing buildings at the north end of the park were considered to be of a temporary nature and that in

due time it was expected the tourist camp would be removed and the park completely developed in accordance with an approved plan for park development. Therefore the Commission disapproved the scheme submitted by Mr. Vint. (Exhibit C)

14. BUTT-MILLET FOUNTAIN: Mr. Kline submitted a sketch suggesting relocation of the Butt-Millet fountain along 17th Street near the Red Cross building. The relocation becomes necessary due to the fact that the District Commissioners want E Street extended along the south side of the White House.

The Commission considered the matter and decided it would be better to place the fountain along 17th Street on the axis of D Street. The design will be changed accordingly and resubmitted to the Commission.

15. WHITE HOUSE SEAL: Under date of January 26th the following memorandum and letter were received from the President:

January 26, 1939.

Memorandum for the Fine Arts Commission:

For preparation of reply for my signature.

F. D. R.

HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York

January 23, 1939.

Dear Boss:

This is a little thing but worth your attention:

Isn't it bad to have the President's Great Seal - symbol of the highest office in the world - set in the floor where it is walked on and even spat upon? It seems to me that it could be put over the lintel with a hidden spot light giving it a sort of aureole.

Usually I am not much on the trifles that make up protocol, but I feel this instance is a violation of good taste as well as

elemental respect, and I think the change would be widely applauded if it came from you.

Warm regard.

(Signed) Bayard

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

The Commission discussed the question of relocation of the President's Seal at the entrance to the White House. Mr. Gugler, who was present, stated that he would not move it. It was suggested that the seal might be placed in depressed form in the floor although this might be dangerous as also stanchions at the edge of the seal.

In considering the matter the secretary brought to the attention of the Commission a memorandum on the subject of the President's seal which was written by Mr. Moore some years ago. It was not the first time that this question of relocating the President's Seal had been raised. The memorandum was read. The Commission decided to send the following reply to the President:

"We have considered this matter carefully and we feel there is no indignity in having the Seal of the President of the United States on the floor of the White House."

Also information contained in the memorandum concerning the President's Seal was sent with the report to the President. (Exhibit H)

18. OFFICE BUILDING AT VERMONT AVENUE AND H STREET ADJACENT TO LAFAYETTE SQUARE: During the joint meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission the question of giving proper treatment to the area adjacent to Lafayette Square was discussed. Attention was called to the proposed new office building to be built on the square at Vermont Avenue and H Street. The building is to be 110 feet high with setbacks to a height of 130 feet.

The Commission expressed concern over this building project and the secretary was asked to communicate with the architects of the building with a view to arranging for a conference with the Commission of Fine Arts concerning the design. It was admitted that the location is outside of the Shipstead-Luce Act area but a very prominent one in view of its proximity to the White House and Lafayette Square.

17. FREER GALLERY OF ART PURCHASES: Mr. Lodge, Director of the Freer Gallery of Art, reported that he desired the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to the purchase of a number of pieces of sculpture and painting. The Commission authorized the Chairman to appoint Mr. Manship and Mr. Savage as a committee with full power to act in this matter. A report approving the objects was received. (Exhibit I)

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p. m.

C O P Y

COMMISSION O FINE ARTS
Washington

January 3, 1939.

Dear Mr. Gibboney:

At the last meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held in Washington on December 10th, Mr. A. B. Cammerer, Executive Officer of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, presented working drawings for the Memorial Building to Thomas Jefferson. Mr. Cammerer requested the Commission's advice upon the detailed treatment of the proposed structure. With this request the Commission is glad to comply. Accordingly the architect members, Messrs. Shepley, Lamb, and Borie were requested to review the plans, which they have done.

On Thursday, December 22nd, I arranged a meeting in New York at the office of Mr. Lamb, for the purpose of reviewing the comments of the architect members of the Commission of Fine Arts with Mr. Otto Eggers, representing the architects. Messrs. Lamb, Eggers, one of Mr. Eggers' representatives, and the writer were present.

The architects of the building indicated their desire to give all possible consideration to the suggestions made to the end that the plans for the building might be improved. Mr. Eggers promised to take up new problems as they arise and to report back concerning the suggestions that were made at the conference.

For the information of your Commission I set forth herewith the items which were discussed with Mr. Eggers.

I. Detail and Ornamentation.

a. The character of the ornament was criticized as lacking originality and appropriateness. For example, the indicated architectural ornaments in certain panels of the interior (eagle or wreath motive), first used in the Forum of Trajan, have been repeated so many times during the past fifty years that they have lost all significance. The Commission suggest the possibility of having the bas relief designed by a sculptor so that it may in some appropriate manner represent the character of the great figure the building is to memorialize.

b. The light-standards shown are also of a hackneyed design. In the discussion of this item the whole problem of lighting the interior came up. Mr. Eggers agreed to make further studies, taking into consideration certain definite suggestions made by Mr. Lamb. This is a most important problem and requires careful thought and much study before a satisfactory but simple solution may be found.

EXHIBIT A

c. It was observed that the architects had designed the pedestal for a statue of Jefferson. This design should not be determined until a sculptor has completed his work. Whether the figure of Jefferson is to be erect or seated is not a matter which can be determined by the architect. The Commission of Fine Arts urges that a sculptor be chosen, preferably by competition, as soon as possible so that the portrait figure of Jefferson, the enclosing of which is the real purpose the building is to serve, may be studied in collaboration with the architects, rather than be added as an afterthought.

d. The Commission believe that the tripods on the piers each side of the entrance steps are unnecessary. These come under the heading of architectural sculpture and are trite in design. It is believed that the more simple treatment, gained by the omission of these, would be much more appropriate.

II. Plan.

The Commission of Fine Arts questions the propriety of including public toilets within a memorial of the character of this one. If in the judgment of the Jefferson Memorial Commission they must be included as a part of the scheme then the entrances to these toilets should be placed at different locations than indicated on the plan, namely, each side of the main entrance just inside the portico. This treatment, the Commission believes, is extremely bad taste. Alternate locations at much less conspicuous places on the plan for these toilet entrances were indicated to the architects.

The Commission of Fine Arts prefer that toilets be excluded from the memorial building and that a small unobtrusive structure be erected in a grove of trees near one of the parking spaces in the close vicinity of the memorial. Such a location would serve a more useful purpose and could be designed and placed in a manner to be completely hidden from view from the memorial and from important points around the memorial. This suggestion is presented for your careful consideration since criticism is bound to follow if public toilets are included as an integral part of the memorial.

III. Materials of Construction.

a. The transition from the marble exterior to the limestone interior has been badly developed. The plan shows one pilaster of a pair in marble, the other in limestone. In order to keep the structure within a budget it has become necessary to economize on the material for the interior. Such treatment as has been indicated is unfortunate and should be developed more carefully after further study. The Commission do not advocate a more expensive building, but rather a careful review of what has been planned, to the end that not too great sacrifice in the materials for the interior design may be necessary. It may be possible to save elsewhere so that the building itself may be all that your Commission desires.

It was pointed out to Mr. Eggers that it would be desirable to take an alternate bid on an all marble interior below but including the cornice.

The problem concerning the materials for the inside of the building was discussed at length with Mr. Eggers, who agreed to give further study to this matter.

A copy of this communication has been forwarded to Mr. A. B. Cammerer.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Stuart Gibboney, Acting Chairman,
The Jefferson Memorial Commission,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION
for the Erection of a Permanent Memorial to the Memory of
THOMAS JEFFERSON
1743 -- 1826

70 Pine Street,
New York, N. Y.
January 18, 1939.

Honorable Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Your letter to me as Acting Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, under date of January 3, 1939, with reference to the working drawings for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Building, went to the House Office Building in Washington and was not received by me until January 10th. After its receipt I conferred with several members of the Commission and submitted a copy of it to our architects, Messrs. Eggers and Higgins, who reported to us the pleasant conference they had with you and Mr. Lamb.

Our architects have made the following recommendations as to the points raised in your letter:

1. (a) The suggestion made by Mr. Clarke entails the employment of a sculptor which must be covered by additional allowance. We agreed, however, to provide stock for any further carving developed by a sculptor. We felt a creditable result could be obtained from an architectural model made under our direction, or if necessary the entire elimination of the carved decoration and the panels devoted exclusively to inscriptions.

(b) The light standards in the Memorial Hall are to be included in the tenders, with an alternate for their omission. We felt that the lighting standards shown would provide in a most impressive manner the little lighting required inasmuch as the building may never be open at night. The entire question of the lighting of the Memorial Hall is to receive further consideration.

We are entirely opposed to the suggestion made by the Fine Arts Commission to provide cove lights over the cornice to give a brightly lighted inner dome.

(c) We concur with the opinion of the Art Commission that the inclusion of a design for the pedestal might be a hardship to a sculptor yet to be selected, consequently we agreed to omit this and to carry same under an allowance to be added to that provided for the statue proper. As to the method of selection of a sculptor,

that is within the province of the Jefferson Memorial Commission.

(d) We have no serious objection to the elimination of the exterior tripods, and have agreed to provide an alternate estimate for their omission.

Their purpose as originally conceived was to provide receptacles for exterior flood lighting units. The Commission's representatives objected to this form of exterior lighting and suggested lighting the back walls of the Portico, throwing the columns into relief.

2. The public toilets are located on the plan as directed by the National Park Service.

Plans have been prepared showing entrances to toilet facilities at each end of the circular surrounding colonnade as suggested by Mr. Clarke. This toilet arrangement has been rejected by the National Park Service with the counter suggestion that the toilets be installed under the outer terrace. This will entail extra building expense and extra piling, the contract for which has already been let. We feel that the best solution is that they be either entirely eliminated from this consideration or installed as shown on the present plans.

3. Alternate estimates will cover several variations of arrangement of marble and limestone in the interior. Our budget limitations decidedly preclude the use of marble throughout, and some form of compromise is essential.

We feel that the steps taken by our architects, as described above, will go a long way toward meeting the points raised in your letter.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Stuart G. Gibboney,
Acting Chairman.

C O P Y

January 28, 1939.

Mr. Stuart G. Gibboney,
70 Pine Street,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Gibboney:

I appreciate having your letter of January eighteenth with reference to the working drawings for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Building. At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held Friday, January twenty-seventh, I received copy of a memorandum from the Chief of the Survey and Construction Division of the National Park Service, copy of which I attach. I wish to refer particularly to one sentence, namely, "The toilet rooms are left in the Memorial as originally planned by the Architects."

The Commission of Fine Arts discussed this matter quite fully at their meeting, and I was directed to write to you and emphasize again the fact that in the judgment of the Commission the inclusion of toilets with entrances to them from the portico of the Memorial is in extremely bad taste. One member of the Commission stated that since these public toilets were the only ones in that general vicinity of the Capital City, that they would become well known to tourists in the course of time and that the Memorial would be used by persons who have no other interest than to visit these toilets. I wish to call your attention to this matter because it may become exceedingly embarrassing to you and to the other members of the Commission as time goes on. I wish again to call your attention to the recommendations of the Commission, "That the toilets be excluded from the Memorial Building and that a small unobtrusive structure be erected in the grove of trees near one of the parking spaces in the close vicinity of the Memorial." To say that the inclusion of public toilets in a great Memorial is incongruous is to put it mildly.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

GDC:MVL
Enc.
cc: A. B. Cammerer

EXHIBIT A-2

United States Commission
for the Erection of a Permanent Memorial to the Memory of
Thomas Jefferson
1743 -- 1826

COMMISSIONERS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ELBERT D. THOMAS — UTAH
AUGUSTINE LONERGAN — CONNECTICUT
CHARLES L. MCNARY — OREGON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN J. BOYLAN — NEW YORK
HOWARD W. SMITH — VIRGINIA
FRANCIS D. CULKIN — NEW YORK

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL FOUNDATION
STUART G. GIBBONEY
DR. GEORGE J. RYAN
DR. FISKE KIMBALL

CHAIRMAN
REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. BOYLAN

VICE CHAIRMEN
ELBERT D. THOMAS
AUGUSTINE LONERGAN
CHARLES L. MCNARY

SECRETARY
HOWARD W. SMITH

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSIONERS
THOMAS J. COOLIDGE JOSEPH P. TUMULTY
BRIG. GEN. JEFFERSON RANDOLPH KEAN

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
JOHN J. BOYLAN
ELBERT D. THOMAS
AUGUSTINE LONERGAN
CHARLES L. MCNARY
HOWARD W. SMITH
FRANCIS D. CULKIN
JOSEPH P. TUMULTY
STUART G. GIBBONEY
DR. FISKE KIMBALL

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

70 Pine Street,
New York, N. Y.
February 8, 1939.

Honorable Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Your letter of January 28th was received on Monday, January 30th and, since its receipt, I have been in communication with the National Park Service, our architects - Messrs. Eggers and Higgins, and Mr. Fiske Kimball, a member of the Commission.

The memorandum from the Chief, Survey & Construction Division of the National Park Service, is not correct in stating that "The toilet rooms are left in the Memorial as originally planned by the Architects" inasmuch as an alternative estimate is being taken for the complete omission of the toilets from the Memorial Building, and also we have instructed our architects to make the necessary drawings and specifications to cover an alternate location for the toilets in the terrace just south of the pedestal on which the urns are shown on the contract drawing. When the bids are in it will then be necessary for the Commission to determine which of the alternative bids, with reference to the toilets, should be accepted. And I can assure you that due consideration will be given to the recommendation of the Commission of Fine Arts as set forth in your letter of January 28th.

Very truly yours,

Stuart G. Gibboney

STUART G. GIBBONEY
Acting Chairman

SGG:EW

EXHIBIT A-3

C O P Y

January 28, 1939.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 27, 1939, considered your design for the Greyhound Bus Terminal to be built on the south side of New York Avenue between Eleventh and Twelfth Streets, N. W. We appreciate your courtesy in submitting the design.

The Commission understand that it is intended to construct the building in marble, but feel that the design represents a phase of contemporary architecture which it would be incongruous to treat in permanent and expensive material. If a fine material were considered it is felt that a simple, clean-cut design would be more appropriate.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Messrs. Wischmeyer, Arrasmith & Elswick,
Architects,
Louisville, Kentucky.

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

January 28, 1939.

My Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 27, 1939, approved the design and location for the first unit of the new War Department Building, and in accordance with a model submitted.

It is understood that a few changes suggested by the Commission, such as fenestration on the west side of the building, will be embodied in the working drawings.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. Louis Simon,
Office of the Supervising Architect,
Procurement Division,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

February 2, 1939.

My dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 27, 1939, approved the design you submitted for the Bureau of the Census Building, Department of Commerce, to be built on the square at Second and D Streets, S. W., with the recommendation that the design show an alternate treatment of pier spandrels. If all the pier spandrels were headers and the intervening space stretchers, it would add interest to the facade. Also, the Commission recommend that a gray brick which has no brownish or yellowish cast be used for the building; and the Commission is asking that a sample of the brick be submitted.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Office of the Supervising Architect,
Procurement Division,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

February 2, 1939

Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth,
Municipal Architect,
District Engineer Department,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Wyeth: Re: Municipal Center Sculpture

The Commission is glad to suggest the names of sculptors for work in connection with the development of the Municipal Center. For the large sculptural groups facing south on John Marshall Place, the Commission suggests the employment of two sculptors, one for each group, who must, of necessity, collaborate closely. The following list of four is presented with the idea that from it you may wish to choose two:

Lee Lawrie, 149 East 119th Street, New York.
John Gregory, 54 West 74th Street, New York.
Sidney Waugh, 101 Park Avenue, New York.
Leo Friedlander, West Hartsdale Avenue, Hartsdale, N.Y.

The Commission suggests that about 70% of the money available for sculpture be spent upon these important groups to be carved in stone.

For the two panels to be developed in ceramics, the Commission suggests four names. It is understood you will choose one to develop a panel for one of the courts since it is understood that you have suggested the name of Henry V. Poor for the other:

Dunbar Beck, 65 West 55th Street, New York.
Thomas L. Johnson, Crow Hill Road, Mount Kisco, N.Y.
Joseph Kiselewski, 324 East 71st Street, New York.
Carl Schmitz, 37 East 28th Street, New York.

The name of Mr. Poor is most satisfactory to the Commission of Fine Arts.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) GILMORE D. CLARKE,
Chairman.

GDC:MVL

EXHIBIT E

C O P Y

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington

January 6, 1939.

My dear Mr. Di Falco:

I was in Washington on Monday, January 2d, and spent part of the morning with Mr. Caemmerer inspecting possible sites for the Marconi Memorial.

I wish to recommend to the Marconi Memorial Foundation the triangle at the intersection of Sixteenth Street and Columbia Road as a possible site for the Marconi Memorial. It seems to me that this triangle would be most appropriate, more particularly in view of its close proximity to the Italian Embassy, which is only one block away. It would be thoroughly appropriate to use a portrait figure of Marconi on this site, where a suitable setting is available at the south end of the triangle, facing south. The Office of National Capital Parks does not object to placing the memorial in this triangle and I am of the opinion that, in all probability, the location would also be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

Please advise me whether or not the Marconi Memorial Foundation approves of the site suggested herein.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. S. Samuel Di Falco,
Secretary,
Marconi Memorial Foundation,
270 Broadway,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT F

C O P Y

January 28, 1939.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 27, 1939, considered sketches submitted by your office for the construction of permanent modern buildings at the East Potomac Park Tourist Camp and disapproved them.

The Commission have understood that the existing buildings were to be of a temporary nature and that in due time East Potomac Park is to be used entirely for park purposes.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G

Memorandum: The President's Seal

It is a common mistake that the brass disc in the floor of the White House entrance hall is the seal of the United States. On the contrary it is the insignia of the President as used upon his flag. In design it differs from the Great Seal in that the head of the eagle is turned in the opposite direction from that of the eagle in the Seal; and possibly in other ways. The design was furnished by the State Department to the architect.

It was placed in the floor of perfectly matched stones selected with great care from the Joliet, Illinois quarries. It is located at the focal point, underneath the lantern (patterned after one at Compiegne, a recognition of the French influence apparent in the White House) and is so raised that one passes around rather than over it. It signifies that the White House is the home of the President of the United States. Underneath, as in a corner-stone, are the records of the redecoration and the history of the House.

It is of interest to note that no thought of indignity has attached itself to the use of such placings. Instances of grave stones flush with the floor of churches are numerous. In England the stone marking the grave of the Unknown Soldier is in the floor of Westminster Abbey.

C O P Y

February 1, 1939.

My dear Mr. President:

In reply to your Memorandum of January 26th with its enclosure of a letter from Mr. Herbert Layard Swope, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, suggesting a relocation of the President's Seal in the White House, I have the honor to inform you that this matter was considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 27, 1939. The Commission feel that no indignity is attached to the placing of the President's Seal in the floor of the entrance hall of the White House.

I am inclosing a brief memorandum on the subject of the President's Seal for your personal information.

Mr. Swope's letter is herewith returned.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

C O P Y

January 27th, 1939.

Dr. C. G. Abbot, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution,

The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades,

as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the

late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

5 Chinese paintings:

a. Ladies Playing Chess, painted in the style of Chou Fang, 9th century, Chinese, T'ang dynasty.

b. River Landscape by Wĕn Pi (Chĕn-ming), 1470-1567, Chinese, Ming dynasty.

c. River landscape by Shen Chou, 1427-1509, Chinese, Ming dynasty.

d. River landscape by Lu Chih, 1495-1576, Chinese, Ming dynasty.

e. Mountain landscape by Ch'iu Ying, flourished 1522-1560. Chinese, Ming dynasty.

1. Bronze mirror dated in correspondence with A. D. 174, Chinese, Han dynasty.

1 Bronze ceremonial vessel of the type p'ou. Chinese, late Chou dynasty, 5th century, B. C.

29 Pieces of carved jade, Chinese, late Chou dynasty, 6th-3rd century, B. C.

EXHIBIT I

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. John E. Lodge, Director, and hereby approve the purchase.

Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

January 27th, 1939.

(Signed) Paul Manship
For the Commission of Fine Arts

Katharine N. Rhoades.

At this point the Commission of Fine Arts, including its Chairman and Secretary, joined the meeting and the meeting resolved itself into a joint meeting, presided over by MAJ. GILMORE D. CLARKE, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts.

55. Central Library Building: (See also Par. 42):

MR. WYETH submitted further studies for the Central Library building, based on the major requirements laid down that the facade should parallel Pennsylvania Avenue and that there shall be a distance of 280 feet between buildings across John Marshall Place.

MR. SHEPLEY, of the Commission of Fine Arts, stated that MR. WYETH had presented his plans to the Commission of Fine Arts this morning, and that they took up first the question of the roof,whether it was necessary to put a red tile roof on a building on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue when it was considered that the Pennsylvania Avenue Triangle group terminated at the Apex Building, and the feeling was that the red tile treatment should be terminated at the Apex Building and not continued across the Avenue. If a red roof is provided on the library building, it probably would require a red roof on the auditorium.

It was suggested that he make a study for a building without embodying all the features of the Triangle group.

MR. WYETH stated that his feeling was that insofar as the building was to be parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue, it should be similar in design to some extent.

Discussion included the feeling [illegible] that the appearance would be better if the building were extended further along Pennsylvania Avenue and C Street, even if there was a lack of balance across C Street; that the parking lot for 200 cars on west end of square left an awkward gap at 6th Street directly across from the entrance to the National Gallery of Art; that future private development of square west of 6th Street would utilize the whole square; that the most important consideration is to have symmetry on the John Marshall Place axis; whether the library building could be extended westward at some future time without change in the facade; that the building as now planned is already more than the library needs; that last June the decision had been to locate the library on the west end nearer the triangle and business center, leaving the larger eastern end to be designed later for some other harmonious use, such as a symphony hall; that this procedure would permit better coordination of architectural design with the auditorium; that a longer facade on Pennsylvania Avenue would give continuity to the Avenue; that the type of building does not lend itself to inside garage facilities; and that it is important in the judgment of the Planning Commission to have the library building cover the whole frontage on Pennsylvania Avenue.

MOTION unanimously carried that it is the pleasure of the two Commissions that MR. WYETH make a study showing the Pennsylvania Avenue facade extending the full length of the square, and resubmit this study to the Commissions.

56. Court Buildings: (See also Par. 40):

MR. SETTLE reviewed this matter, as more fully stated in Paragraph 40 of these minutes.

The question of providing a building for the Recorder of Deeds may also be involved in this matter.

No action.

57. Property Surrounding Lafayette Square: (See also Par. 49):

MR. NOLEN reviewed this subject, as more fully covered in Paragraph 49 of these minutes. He stated further that the Commission has been impressed with the lack of any control over private property fronting on Lafayette Square because the Shipstead Act applies only to the properties on the east side of the Square. It is now proposed to erect a large office building at Vermont Avenue and H Street, containing 250,000 square feet, the corner of which will front on the Square. The plans for this building will not come before the Commission of Fine Arts, because the site is not covered by the Shipstead Act. The building will have a sheer height of 130 feet fronting on Lafayette Square and 90 feet to a setback for the other facades. The other question involves the development of private property opposite the State Department.

Discussion included the fact that there has been a general feeling that the constitutionality of the Shipstead Act was "pretty close", and that it was best to go along with the present authority; that there might be great danger and jeopardy to the whole Act if an effort should be made to include all properties facing on Lafayette Square; suggestion of MAJ. CLARKE that the promoters of the office building might be brought in and it be pointed out to them just how far the Shipstead Act would affect their building, and if possible to have them entertain a friendly attitude in this matter.

It was agreed that MR. NOLEN would inform MAJ. CLARKE as to the names of the buildings of the proposed office building at Vermont Avenue and H Street, and that the Commission of Fine Arts will invite them to go over the matter with his Commission.

58. Gravelly Point Airport: (See also Par. 35):

COL. SUMPTER SMITH of the Civil Aeronautics Authority appeared before the Commission and discussed their plans for the Gravelly Point Airport. He reviewed in detail the layout of the run-ways and length and location of the administrative and hangar buildings, and the changes that will be necessary in connection with relocation of the Mt. Vernon Highway.

Discussion included the question of whether the Mt. Vernon Highway is at present in a dangerous location with respect to the airport, and whether it would constitute a hazard; that the elevation of the end of the run-ways is being raised about six feet higher than the adjoining roadway; whether it would be practicable to put the Highway in a tunnel on account of the low ground; whether it would be possible to have a 6-lane roadway at least to the site of the airport; the feeling of MAJ. CLARKE that he would rather see the road relocated than to see something temporary done that would have to be changed later; locating the road so that the airport would not be seen by motorists; that buildings above a certain height will become a hazard to the airport; that consideration must be given to the architectural treatment of the buildings to be harmonious with the airport and the Mt. Vernon Highway; whether the Highway would have to be considered as an important part of the airport plan; suggestion of facing the airport buildings along the Highway, and having a parking area in front of them, and building a new road for the main traffic; that all the layouts for the airport have been based on a dual highway; that the administration building should probably be located near the present road.

MAJ. CLARKE stated that the only way the two Commissions can act on this matter is to have the Procurement Division prepare a plan showing what their best conclusions are, which MR. REYNOLDS agreed to do, as well as prepare a model of the airport layout.

MAJ. CLARKE also stated that his Commission feels that the Mt. Vernon Highway should probably be relocated.

MR. FINNAN stated that the Civil Aeronautics Authority should consider any land acquisitions for replacement of the Highway as part of the airport development, and should include such items in their budget, as well as reconstruction of the Highway wherever it might be relocated.

59. War Department Building: (See also Par. 39):

MESSRS. REYNOLDS and SIMON of the Procurement Division, present for discussion of this subject.

MR. SIMON presented a model of the proposed building, and discussed the details of the plan and model. He stated that the axis has been set as the intersection of New York and Virginia Avenues, which settled the question of the axis of the head-house, and which gives 216.37 feet from the center line of E Street South to the axis. They have also established a building line on South E Street, which carries the north face of the building practically on line with the north existing wall of the Interior

building, excepting the stylobate. Consideration was given to the Commission's request for opening the axis on the Lincoln Memorial and the building is kept back 67 feet from the center line of 23rd Street. In order that the lack of balance would not be intensified by a long facade, the mass of the building has also been broken up. The only point about which there is any difference is when this building is placed in comparison with the Interior building, a certain distance from the north face of this building to the sidewalk is obtained, which the Commission felt would not give enough space for planting. The area as shown for this purpose is 11 feet, and is 9 feet at the narrowest point and the widest point 27 feet. MR. SIMON also stated that they are now within the limits prescribed by the Commission. The Procurement Division also felt that the areaways could not be left out.

MOTION unanimously carried that the two Commissions approve in general the treatment for the War Department building, as shown on the model and plan bearing File No. 1.18-346, subject to further study of details. In explaining this action, MAJ. CLARKE stated that the Commissions are merely approving the front part of the building or head-house, including the location. In other words, the location and treatment of this part of the building is approved.

In connection with the plaza, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

That a Committee, composed of MAJ. CLARKE, representing the Commission of Fine Arts, MR. HUBBARD, representing this Commission, CAPT. WHITEHURST of the District Government, and MR. NOLEN of this Commission, is appointed to make a study of the plaza and submit the same to a joint meeting of the two Commissions.

60. Census Bureau Building: (See also Par. 38):

MR. NOLEN reviewed this matter, as more fully discussed in Paragraph 38, and stated that the Commission had approved the height limits and setback for the building.

MR. SIMON stated that it would be practically impossible to provide parking for the large number of employees to be housed in this building, and MR. REYNOLDS stated that his Committee has recommended that the block to the north of the site be purchased for parking purposes, with which the Budget Bureau agrees, but there was some feeling that to tie this matter up with the legislation for the Census Building might be dangerous. The proposal, however, is to obtain funds to acquire this block ultimately.

MOTION unanimously carried that the two Commissions approve the location and setback lines and height for the proposed Census Bureau building, as shown on plan bearing File No. 1.17-58. (See also Par. 38 for this action.)

61. Gallatin Statue:

MR. SIMON stated that in 1927 an Act of Congress was passed which provided that the Gallatin Statue be placed somewhere on the grounds of the Treasury Building, and preferably at the north front. It also provided that permission should be granted to any organization to erect a statue with private capital within two years of that Act. Eleven years later a similar Act was passed to put the statue on the west side, which brought it before the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission of Fine Arts felt that the statue should be located on the north side to replace the fountain now there. Estimates were prepared to determine whether or not it would be possible to relocate the fountain and locate the statue on that side, but it was found approximately $4500 more would be needed. Both Commissions have stated that it would be a mistake to erect a statue on the west side. The possibility now appears to obtain funds to remove the fountain and transfer it to the National Park Service so that the statue can be erected, although it may be necessary to obtain additional funds from Congress.

No action.

The Commission of Fine Arts withdrew at this point, and COL. ATKINS presided as Chairman of the Park and Planning Commission.